Hey, Jim, 6/27/76

What that eminent practitioner of the New York legal art calls a cranky, freaked-out old man sure as hell isn't pooper out. It is 11 a.m. and I'mabbutto take a break and skim the paper before Schweiker Faces the Nation. I have by now taken a walk, not as long as susual, and - sit down , please- - -

Written a draft of 20 pages, perhaps 8,000 words, on why Huie's testimony should be preserved by the deposition you requested after the evidentiary hearing.

I have departed from what we discussed by exceeding it. I think that by which I go farthur should be in the record and is strong pressure on McRae while giving him a saving of his own, self-besmirched face.

While I was writing the 14 pages of the draft, alas again off the top of the head, I thought of omissions that are six more pages.

Part of this is an accreditation of my expertise. I have no objection to your cutting out that if you first thing about it and its overtones and implications.

Part is a first-person account of publishing by but but limited to the two, not, three, publishers in question, Doubleday, Dell and Bantam. If you want to attach the cable I have on the Castillo/spook book I killed I'll be able to do it with some masking. That was a Bantam deal.

Once I got to working I thought of what I believe is relevant that we did not discuss. I think in toto it is one hell of a load on Temkin, Huie, Frank, the prosecution and phrased in a manner to protect hi, McRae.

I want you to consider making some sacrifices in literary perfection in this case and to shift the balance if you are not positive you have to cut. We should use this affidavit for every conceivable purpose that is not inappropriate, but just justifying ~~[illegible]~~ deposing Huie now.

While it is absolutely factual and first-person, as you will see, it it is also political and we now need this political emphasis even if at no point is it explicit.

I strongly encourage you first to read it, if you desire making notes a d corrections as you do; and then if you want to reorder, do it by cutting it up and pasting it together than than by an initial rewrite. After you have done this I am surait will take much less time for rewriting.

I also believe that if you do this instead of beginning with a rewrite, you will not only save much time but may come to see what you may not if you have an initial rewrite and your customary high literary standards in mine. Forget the literary where it means time in this case. We do not have the time and we do need the content.

This is a need and a time for which I'd like you, this time, to try it the way I suggest with content and meaning of content and conservation of the time we really do not have as your primary considerations.

I need a respite, want to let it cool a little before I rear it and despite the heat also want to get more mowing done. This will probably mean that I can't read or at least complete reading it today and may not by tomorrow's mail, in which this will be and will alert you id the draft is not with it.

I will be including no attachments. If you want them I will provide them. Even, I think, the Books in Print listing of me as a publisher. No, what I have is the ad. You'd want the textual listing that can be made at the library but I do not have.

I consulted only those Temkin records I have. Not even Huie's letter to me. If you think it is necessary, you have it can can mark it as an exhibit before copying. I can dig out the Blair Times review and ad, I think, unless they are filed with the original of F-U.

My knowledge of Huie and the Mamie Stober deal comes from the old friend whose arrangement for that movie Huie himself ruined by ego, by a fake rewrite of an unacceptable script what was almost identical with the unacceptable one.

I've worked the spook stuff in on purpose and think it is relevant. It can be expanded to include part of what is in the draft of my letter to McRae.

Best,